REMARKS

This amendment responds to the office action mailed December 1, 2003. In the office action the Examiner:

- requested Applicants' reasoning for why new claims 23, 24, and 26-34 are patentable over U.S. Patent No. 4,992,940 to Dworkin (hereinafter "Dworkin"), U.S. Patent No. 6,490,567) to Gregory (hereinafter "Gregory"), "WebData.com Debuts Online Shopping Price Comparisons" (hereinafter "Kim"), and United States Patent No. 5,710,887 to Chelliah *et al.* (hereinafter "Chelliah").

After entry of this amendment, the pending claims remain: claims 1-21 and 23-34.

Applicants apologize for the failure to explicitly indicate the grounds for why new claims 23, 24, and 26-34 are patentable over the cited prior art in the September 3, 2003 response to the July 8, 2003 office action. In the September 3, 2003 response, rational for why each of claims 1-21 are patentable over the prior art was provided. In particular independent claims 1, 18, and 21 each recite the developing of an extraction pattern, a process that has no parallel in the prior art. Claims 2-17 and 19-20 ultimately depend from claims 1 or 18 and are therefore patentable over the cited art for at least the same reasons that claims 1 and 18 are patentable over the cited art.

New claims 23-26 and 29 ultimately depend from claim 1 and are therefore patentable over the cited prior art for at least the same reasons given for the patentability of claim 1 in the September 3, 2003 response. New claims 27, 28, and 30 ultimately depend from claim 18 and are therefore patentable over the cited prior art for at least the same reasons given for the patentability of claim 18 in the September 3, 2003 response. Claim 31 depends from claim 21 and is therefore patentable over the cited prior art for at least the same reasons given for the patentability of claim 21 in the September 3, 2003 response.

New claim 32 recites the development of a description of a data of interest that includes an extraction pattern. New claim 32 is patentable over the cited art because none of the cited art has the extraction pattern recited in claim 32. As discussed in the September 3, 2003 response, Applicants' extraction patterns parse output of target web sites looking for matching subsequences. And, in order to work, Applicants' extraction patterns are passed a value that can

serve as an extraction parameter for the extraction pattern. No combination of Dworkin, Gregory, Kim or Chelliah teach or suggest such a feature. Claims 33 and 34 depend from claim 32 and are therefore patentable over the cited art for at least the same reasons that claim 32 is patentable over the cited art.

CONCLUSION

In light of the above amendments and remarks, the Applicants respectfully request that the Examiner reconsider this application with a view towards allowance. The Examiner is invited to call the undersigned attorney at (650) 493-4935, if a telephone call could help resolve any remaining items.

Respectfully submitted,

Date: December 24, 2003

Reg. No. 42,813 for 31,066

Gary S. Williams (Reg. No.)
PENNIE & EDMONDS LLP
3300 Hillview Avenue
Palo Alto, California 94304
(650) 493-4935